

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application in light of the present amendment and remarks is respectfully requested. In the present response, claims 1-17 have been canceled, and new claims 18-33 have been added. Claims 18-33 remain pending in this application.

Formal matters

Claim 12 has been rejected under 35 USC 112(1) as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. This rejection is moot in view of Applicant's cancellation of claim 12.

Substantive matters

Claims 1, 2, and 4-17 have been rejected on various substantive grounds. These rejections are moot in view of Applicant's cancellation of those claims.

Claim 3 has been indicated as having allowable subject matter. More specifically, claim 3 has been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but has been indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims.

In response, rather than merely amending claim 3 according to Examiner's suggestions, Applicant has elected to present a new claim 18 that includes substantially all of the limitations of claims 1 and 3, but that is arranged in a more logical manner and that cures some of the potential formal problems that were originally present in the language of claims 1 and 3. New claim 18 has been carefully drafted to be devoid of any potentially objectionable language (e.g., "making it possible," "it being possible," and "may be used" have been omitted) that was originally present in claims 1 and 3. Applicant notes that new claim 18 is directed to an illumination device (rather than a circuit arrangement) in order to render it more consistent with

the intended scope of dependent claims 19-33. Accordingly, Applicant submits that new claim 18 should be allowable on the same substantive basis as claim 3.

New claims 19-33 recite substantially the same subject matter that was originally present in claims 2, 4-11, and 12-17. However, each of new claims 19-33 is dependent, either directly or indirectly, on new claim 18 which, as previously noted, should be allowable on the same basis as claim 3. Accordingly, new claims 19-33 are allowable by virtue of their dependence on claim 18. Moreover, new claims 19-33 include additional limitations that, in combination the limitations of claim 18, render those claims further distinct and nonobvious over the references of record. More particularly:

(i) New claim 20 includes recitations substantially similar to those of claim 2, but in dependence on claim 18. Thus, claim 20 should be allowable on the same basis as claim 18. Moreover, claim 20 includes additional limitations that, in combination with the limitations of claim 18, render claim 20 further distinct and nonobvious over the references of record. Accordingly, claim 20 should be deemed allowable.

(ii) New claim 22 includes recitations substantially similar to those of claim 4, but in dependence on claim 18. Thus, claim 22 should be allowable on the same basis as claim 18. Moreover, claim 22 includes additional limitations that, in combination with the limitations of claim 18, render claim 22 further distinct and nonobvious over the references of record. Accordingly, claim 22 should be deemed allowable.

(iii) New claim 24 includes recitations substantially similar to those of claim 5, but in dependence on claim 18. Thus, claim 24 should be allowable on the same basis as claim 18. Moreover, claim 24 includes additional limitations that, in combination with the limitations of claim 18, render claim 24 further distinct and nonobvious over the references of record. Accordingly, claim 24 should be deemed allowable.

(iv) New claim 26 includes recitations substantially similar to those of claim 6, but in dependence on claims 18 and 24. Thus, claim 26 should be allowable on the same basis as claims 18 and 24. Moreover, claim 26 includes additional limitations that, in combination with the limitations of claims 18 and 24, render claim 26 further distinct and nonobvious over the references of record. Accordingly, claim 26 should be deemed allowable.

(v) New claim 28 includes recitations substantially similar to those of claim 7, but in dependence on claims 18 and 24. Thus, claim 28 should be allowable on the same basis as claims 18 and 24. Moreover, claim 28 includes additional limitations that, in combination with the limitations of claims 18 and 24, render claim 28 further distinct and nonobvious over the references of record. Accordingly, claim 28 should be deemed allowable.

(vi) New claim 30 includes recitations substantially similar to those of claim 8, but in dependence on claims 18, 24, and 28. Thus, claim 30 should be allowable on the same basis as claims 18, 24, and 28. Moreover, claim 30 includes additional limitations that, in combination with the limitations of claims 18, 24, and 28, render claim 30 further distinct and nonobvious over the references of record. Accordingly, claim 30 should be deemed allowable.

(vii) New claim 32 includes recitations substantially similar to those of claim 9, but in dependence on claims 18, 24, 28, and 30. Thus, claim 32 should be allowable on the same basis as claims 18, 24, 28, and 30. Moreover, claim 32 includes additional limitations that, in combination with the limitations of claims 18, 24, 28, and 30, render claim 32 further distinct and nonobvious over the references of record. Accordingly, claim 32 should be deemed allowable.

(viii) New claims 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, and 33 include recitations substantially similar to those of claims 11 and 13-17, but in dependence (directly or indirectly) on claim 18. Thus, claims 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, and 33 should be allowable on the same basis

as claim 18, as well any intervening claims. Moreover, claims 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, and 33 include additional limitations that, in combination with the limitations of claim 18, as well as their respective intervening claims, render those claims further distinct and nonobvious over the references of record. Accordingly, claims 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29, 31, and 33 should be deemed allowable.

In drafting new claims 19-33, Applicant has also attempted to cure any potential formal problems that were present in the language of claims 2, 4-11, and 12-17.

Applicant respectfully submits that new claims 18-33 are in a condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, passing of this case is now in order. Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's agent by telephone if such communication may be helpful in the further examination of this case. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being
deposited with the United States Postal Service as
first-class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

On November 9, 2005
(Date of Deposit)

Kenneth D. Labudda, Reg. No. 41,134
Name of applicant, assignee, or Registered rep.

Kenneth D. Labudda 11/09/2005
Signature Date

Respectfully submitted,

Mourad Boulouednine, et al.

by: Kenneth D. Labudda 11/09/2005
Kenneth D. Labudda
Agent for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 41,134
OSRAM SYLVANIA INC.
Phone: (847) 726-6448
FAX: (847) 726-6599